Google Inc. et al v. Egger et al Doc. 624 Att. 1

ATTACHMENT # 2

Dockets.Justia.com

May 31, 2006
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No.06-05-13:ADJ:acr

Renee C. Redman
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
32 Grand Street
Hartford, CT 06106

George Moreira
AT&T
310 Orange Street
New Haven, CT 06510

Mary Jane Lee, Esq.
Verizon
140 West Street, 27th Floor
New York, NY 10007-2109

Re: Docket No. 06-05-13, Application of American Civil Liberties Union of CT (ACLU-CT) for Investigation of AT&T and Verizon regarding Disclosure of CT Customer Information and Request for Rule Making

Dear Mses. Redman, Lee, and Mr. Moreira:

Enclosed are interrogatories numbered TE-1 through TE-3 directed to ACLU-CT, TE-4 directed to AT&T, and TE-5 directed to Verizon. The responses to these questions have been deemed necessary by the Department of Public Utility Control (Department) in connection with the above referenced docket, and will become a part of the record in this proceeding. Please note that persons responsible for responses must be available for cross-examination during a hearing, if held, and must attest to the truth and accuracy of their responses.

Please submit the responses to the Department's Executive Secretary no later than June 14, 2006, by 4:00 p.m. The Department encourages the submission of responses as soon as they are available rather than delaying until all answers are completed. **Please list each question and answer on the same sheet of paper using a separate sheet for each interrogatory number, and sequentially number the pages of each response (e.g., p. 1 of 5, etc.). At the top of each page, clearly identify the Docket Number, the interrogatory number (including the prefix), the**

name of the company and the person responsible for the response, and the date of submission.

Similarly, each Late Filed Exhibit that may be submitted after hearing in this docket shall be sequentially numbered and identified with the Docket Number, Late Filed Exhibit Number, page number, the name of the company and the person responsible for the exhibit, and the date of submission.

If a response to any of the requested information has already been filed in response to another Party or Intervenor's interrogatory(ies) in this proceeding, please reference the interrogatory which provides the information. It is the respondent's responsibility to ensure that any such information is on file with the Executive Secretary of the Department.

Documents must be filed with the Executive Secretary of the Department in both electronic and paper form. The date and time of filing shall be the date and time the Department first receives a complete electronic version or the paper version and the required number of paper copies. Unless otherwise specified, filings are due by 4:00 p.m. on or before any required date. If a complete electronic version of the filing is submitted through the Department's Web Filing System, only one paper version of the filing is generally required. (For exceptionally voluminous or complex filings, the Department reserves the right to request additional paper copies.)

If a complete electronic version of the filing is not web filed, submit an original and five (5) copies for all briefs, reply briefs and comments/written exceptions. Submit an original and five (5) copies of all other documents. Each copy shall be collated and secured with the docket number prominently displayed on the first page. If additional paper copies of interrogatory responses and Late Filed Exhibits are required, each page shall be three-hole punched.

All Parties and Intervenors are required to serve each other with a copy of all documents submitted to the Department and the Office of Consumer Counsel. The current service list for this docket is enclosed. Updated service lists are immediately available on the Department's website and the lists will also be mailed.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL

Louise E. Rickard
Acting Executive Secretary

Enclosures (2)
cc: Service List

DOCKET NO. 06-05-13

APPLICATION OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF CT (ACLU-CT) FOR INVESTIGATION OF AT&T AND VERIZON REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF CT CUSTOMER INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR RULE MAKING

Interrogatories

Interrogatories TE-1 through TE-3 are directed to the ACLU-CT:

TE-1 List the customer information provided to the National Security Agency (NSA) by the AT&T Connecticut, AT&T Woodbury (collectively, AT&T) and/or Verizon New York (Verizon, together the Companies) Connecticut telephone company affiliates on which the American Civil Liberties Union of Connecticut (ACLU-CT) bases its May 24, 2006 complaint (Complaint). Indicate the specific time period during which the Companies' Connecticut telephone company affiliates provided this information to the NSA.

TE-2 Besides the media reports on which the ACLU-CT has based its Complaint, provide all additional evidence (e.g., sworn testimony, spreadsheets, copies of AT&T and/or Verizon customer data provided to the NSA, etc.) that supports the May 24, 2006 filing with the Department.

TE-3 Indicate the Companies Connecticut telephone company affiliates' service offerings from which the customer data provided to the NSA was derived (intrastate, interstate or both). Include all evidence that supports the ACLU-CT's response.

Interrogatory TE-4 is directed to AT&T:

TE-4 Did the AT&T Connecticut telephone company affiliates provide any customer information to the NSA? If yes, provide a description of that information and the time period during which the Connecticut telephone company affiliates made this information available. Indicate the service offerings from which the customer data was derived (intrastate, interstate or both). What was the nature of the request made by the NSA for the information?

Interrogatory TE-5 is directed to Verizon:

TE-5 Did the Verizon Connecticut telephone company affiliate provide any customer information to the NSA? If yes, provide a description of that information and the time period during which the Connecticut telephone company affiliates made this information available. Indicate the service offerings from which the customer data was derived (intrastate, interstate or both). What was the nature of the request made by the NSA for the information?

July 17, 2006
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 06-05-13:ADJ:acr

Renee C. Redman, Esq.
ACLU-CT
32 Grand Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Mary Jane Lee, Esq.
Verizon New York, Inc.
140 West Street
27th Floor
New York, NY 10036

George M. Moreira, Esq.
SNET d/b/a AT&T Connecticut
310 Orange Street
New Haven, CT 06510

Re: Docket No. 06-05-13, Application of the ACLU-CT for Investigation of AT&T and Verizon Regarding Disclosure of CT Customer Information and Request for Rule-Making

Dear Ms. Redman, Ms. Lee and Mr. Moreira:

Enclosed are interrogatories numbered TE-6 through TE-8 directed to ACLU-CT and TE-9 through TE-16 directed to Verizon New York, Inc. and AT&T Connecticut. The responses to these questions have been deemed necessary by the Department of Public Utility Control (Department) in connection with the above referenced docket, and will become a part of the record in this proceeding. Please note that persons responsible for responses must be available for cross-examination during a hearing, if held, and must attest to the truth and accuracy of their responses.

Please submit the responses to the Department's Executive Secretary no later than August 4, 2006, by 4:00 p.m. The Department encourages the submission of responses as soon as they are available rather than delaying until all answers are completed. **Please list each question and answer on the same sheet of paper using a separate sheet for each interrogatory number, and sequentially number the pages of each response (e.g., p. 1 of 5, etc.). At the top of each page, clearly identify the Docket Number, the interrogatory number (including the prefix), the name of the company and the person responsible for the response, and the date of submission.**

Similarly, each Late Filed Exhibit that may be submitted after hearing in this docket shall be sequentially numbered and identified with the Docket Number, Late Filed Exhibit Number, page number, the name of the company and the person responsible for the exhibit, and the date of submission.

If a response to any of the requested information has already been filed in response to another Party or Intervenor's interrogatory(ies) in this proceeding, please reference the interrogatory which provides the information. It is the respondent's responsibility to ensure that any such information is on file with the Executive Secretary of the Department.

Documents must be filed with the Executive Secretary of the Department in both electronic and paper form. The date and time of filing shall be the date and time the Department first receives a complete electronic version or the paper version and the required number of paper copies. Unless otherwise specified, filings are due by 4:00 p.m. on or before any required date. If a complete electronic version of the filing is submitted through the Department's Web Filing System, only one paper version of the filing is generally required. (For exceptionally voluminous or complex filings, the Department reserves the right to request additional paper copies.)

If a complete electronic version of the filing is not web filed, submit an original and eight (8) copies for all briefs, reply briefs and comments/written exceptions. Submit an original and six (6) copies of all other documents. Each copy shall be collated and secured with the docket number prominently displayed on the first page. If additional paper copies of interrogatory responses and Late Filed Exhibits are required, each page shall be three-hole punched.

All Parties and Intervenors are required to serve each other with a copy of all documents submitted to the Department and the Office of Consumer Counsel. The current service list for this docket is enclosed. Updated service lists are immediately available on the Department's website and the lists will also be mailed.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL

Louise E. Rickard
Acting Executive Secretary

Enclosures (2)

cc: Service List

Interrogatories TE-6-TE-8 are for ACLU

TE-6 Provide any documentary, substantive and direct evidence to substantiate the claim of ACLU that customer proprietary network information (CPNI) was disseminated by Verizon and AT&T as alleged in your May 24, 2006, petition.

TE-7 If it is determined that AT&T and Verizon violated the restrictions on disclosing CPNI what remedy is ACLU requesting?

TE-8 Cite the authority that the Department has to grant your requested remedy.

Interrogatories TE-9-TE-17 are for Verizon and AT&T

TE-9 What is the nature of the CPNI information that the Company retains about its customers?

TE-10 At the time cited in the ACLU complaint what was the Company policy regarding dissemination of CPNI?

TE-11 Has that policy changed? If so what is that policy now?

TE-12 Under what circumstances will the Company release CPNI to any state or Federal government agency or private entity? Cite the legal authority for permitting such release.

TE-13 Has the Company released CPNI to the NSA or any other Federal government entity as alleged by the ACLU in its May 24 2006 petition?

TE-14 If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company issued an order or subpoena to disclose the CPNI?

TE-15 If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company paid for disclosing the CPNI to the NSA or other government agency?

TE-16 If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company under any threat of sanctions for failing to provide the CPNI?

TE-17 If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company's release of CPNI in compliance with the Company's CPNI policy in existence at the time of the release of the CPNI?

AT&T Services, Inc.
310 Orange Street, 8th Floor
New Haven, CT 06510
Phone 203-771-2110
Fax 203-771-6577
Service List e-mail:
ATTConnecticutServiceList@att.com

Merrie Cavanaugh[1]
Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary

June 14, 2006

Louise E. Rickard, Acting Executive Secretary
Department of Public Utility Control
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: Docket No. 06-05-13
Application of American Civil Liberties Union of CT (ACLU-CT) for Investigation of AT&T and Verizon Regarding Disclosure of CT Customer Information and Request for Rule Making

Dear Ms. Rickard:

The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut herein file its **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY TE-4** issued by the Department of Public Utility Control on May 31, 2006 in the above-referenced proceeding.

Service has been made pursuant to §16-1-15 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies. This filing is being submitted as an electronic web filing and is complete.

Should there be any questions concerning this submission, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

[1] Only licensed to practice law in Texas.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Customer Information provided to the National Security Agency

TE-4: Did the AT&T Connecticut telephone company affiliates provide any customer information to the NSA? If yes, provide a description of that information and the time period during which the Connecticut telephone company affiliates made this information available. Indicate the service offerings from which the customer data was derived (intrastate, interstate or both). What was the nature of the request made by the NSA for the information?

Answer: AT&T Connecticut objects to this interrogatory in light of the national security and state secrets' concerns that have been raised by the United States. *See* Written Comments of The Southern New England Telephone Company and The Woodbury Telephone Company filed today under separate cover.

AT&T Services, Inc.
310 Orange Street, 8th Floor
New Haven, CT 06510
Phone 203-771-2110
Fax 203-771-6577
Service List e-mail:
ATTConnecticutServiceList@att.com

Merrie Cavanaugh[1]
Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary

August 4, 2006

Louise E. Rickard, Acting Executive Secretary
Department of Public Utility Control
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: Docket No. 06-05-13
Application of American Civil Liberties Union of CT (ACLU-CT) for Investigation of AT&T and Verizon Regarding Disclosure of CT Customer Information and Request for Rule Making

Dear Ms. Rickard:

The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut herein files its **RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES TE-9 THROUGH TE-17** issued by the Department of Public Utility Control on July 19, 2006 in the above-referenced proceeding.

Service has been made pursuant to §16-1-15 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies. This filing is being submitted as an electronic web filing and is complete.

Should there be any questions concerning this submission, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

---

1 Only licensed to practice law in Texas.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Customer Proprietary Network Information Retention

Witness Responsible : Ramona S. Carlow

TE-9: What is the nature of the CPNI information that the Company retains about its customers?

Answer: CPNI information that the company may retain about its customers is defined at 47 U.S.C. § 222h(1) which states that "The term 'customer proprietary network information' means — (A) information that relates to the quantity, technical configuration, type, destination, location, and amount of use of a telecommunications service subscribed to by any customer of a telecommunications carrier, and that is made available to the carrier by the customer solely by virtue of the carrier-customer relationship; and (B) information contained in the bills pertaining to telephone exchange service or telephone toll service received by a customer of a carrier; except that such term does not include subscriber list information."

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Customer Proprietary Network Information Dissemination

Witness Responsible: Ramona S. Carlow

TE-10: At the time cited in the ACLU complaint what was the Company policy regarding dissemination of CPNI?

Answer: At the time cited in the ACLU complaint, the Company policy regarding dissemination of CPNI was that the Company does not sell CPNI to unaffiliated third parties and abides by all federal and state CPNI rules that apply to telecommunications carriers.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Company Policy on Customer Proprietary Network Information

Witness Responsible: Ramona S. Carlow

TE-11: Has that policy changed? If so what is that policy now?

Answer: The policy regarding dissemination of CPNI has not changed.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Release of Customer Proprietary Network Information

Witness Responsible: Ramona S. Carlow

TE-12: Under what circumstances will the Company release CPNI to any state or Federal government agency or private entity? Cite the legal authority for permitting such release.

Answer: The Company will release CPNI to a state or federal government agency or private entity in accordance with the provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 222. Examples of circumstances provided in the statute under which a telecommunications carrier may lawfully disclose CPNI include: as required by law, with the approval of the customer, for billing purposes, to protect the rights or property of the carrier, to protect users and other carriers from unlawful or abusive use of service, and to facilitate the provision of emergency services.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Disclosure of Customer Proprietary Network Information

TE-13: Has the Company released CPNI to the NSA or any other Federal government entity as alleged by the ACLU in its May 24 2006 petition?

Answer: AT&T Connecticut ("AT&T-CT") objects to this interrogatory in light of the national security and state secrets' concerns that have been raised by the United States.[1]

[1] *See* AT&T-CT Joint Written Comments filed on June 14, 2006; AT&T-CT Supplement to Joint Written Comments filed on June 16, 2006; and AT&T-CT Joint Written Reply Comments filed on June 28, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Subpoenas for Disclosure of Customer Proprietary Network Information

TE-14: If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company issued an order or subpoena to disclose the CPNI?

Answer: AT&T Connecticut ("AT&T-CT") objects to this interrogatory in light of the national security and state secrets' concerns that have been raised by the United States.[1]

[1] *See* AT&T-CT Joint Written Comments filed on June 14, 2006; AT&T-CT Supplement to Joint Written Comments filed on June 16, 2006; and AT&T-CT Joint Written Reply Comments filed on June 28, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Payment for Disclosure of Customer Proprietary Network Information

TE-15: If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company paid for disclosing the CPNI to the NSA or other government agency?

Answer: AT&T Connecticut ("AT&T-CT") objects to this interrogatory in light of the national security and state secrets' concerns that have been raised by the United States.[1]

[1] *See* AT&T-CT Joint Written Comments filed on June 14, 2006; AT&T-CT Supplement to Joint Written Comments filed on June 16, 2006; and AT&T-CT Joint Written Reply Comments filed on June 28, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Sanctions for Failure to Provide Customer Proprietary Network Information

TE-16: If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company under any threat of sanctions for failing to provide the CPNI?

Answer: AT&T Connecticut ("AT&T-CT") objects to this interrogatory in light of the national security and state secrets' concerns that have been raised by the United States.[1]

---

[1] *See* AT&T-CT Joint Written Comments filed on June 14, 2006; AT&T-CT Supplement to Joint Written Comments filed on June 16, 2006; and AT&T-CT Joint Written Reply Comments filed on June 28, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatory to The Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Connecticut

Company Policy Regarding Release of Customer Proprietary Network Information

TE-17: If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company's release of CPNI in compliance with the Company's CPNI policy in existence at the time of the release of the CPNI?

Answer: AT&T Connecticut ("AT&T-CT") objects to this interrogatory in light of the national security and state secrets' concerns that have been raised by the United States.[1]

[1] *See* AT&T-CT Joint Written Comments filed on June 14, 2006; AT&T-CT Supplement to Joint Written Comments filed on June 16, 2006; and AT&T-CT Joint Written Reply Comments filed on June 28, 2006.

140 West Street
27th Floor
New York, NY 10007-2109
Tel (212) 321-8118
Fax (212) 962-1687
mary.jane.lee@verizon.com

Mary Jane Lee
Assistant General Counsel

June 14, 2006

VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND ELECTRONIC MEANS

Ms. Louise E. Rickard
Acting Executive Secretary
Department of Public Utility Control
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 06-05-13 — Application of the American Civil Liberties Union of CT for Investigation of AT&T and Verizon Regarding Disclosure of CT Customer Information and Request for Rulemaking

Dear Secretary Rickard:

Enclosed please find Verizon New York Inc.'s response to the Department of Public Utility Control ("Department")'s interrogatory TE-5.

This filing is submitted utilizing the Department's Web-Based Filing System. The electronic filing is complete and the paper original will be sent by overnight delivery to the Department. Service has been made pursuant to Section 16-1-15 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jane Lee

Mary Jane Lee

Attachments

cc: Office of Consumer Counsel (2 copies)
Service List

TE-5: Did the Verizon Connecticut telephone company affiliate provide any customer information to the NSA? If yes, provide a description of that information and the time period during which the Connecticut telephone company affiliates made this information available. Indicate the service offerings from which the customer data was derived (intrastate, interstate or both). What was the nature of the request made by the NSA for the information?

Response: Verizon New York Inc. ("Verizon") objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in its June 14, 2006 letter filed with the Department of Public Utility Control ("Department") in response to the Department's May 31, 2006 notice requesting comments. As explained in that letter, Verizon cannot respond to this interrogatory to the extent it relates to a classified NSA program because it cannot confirm or deny any cooperation with any such NSA program. Verizon reserves all of its rights and does not waive any additional objections it may have with respect to this interrogatory.

140 West Street
27th Floor
New York, NY 10007-2109
Tel (212) 321-8118
Fax (212) 962-1687
mary.jane.lee@verizon.com

Mary Jane Lee
Assistant General Counsel

verizon

August 4, 2006

VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND ELECTRONIC MEANS

Ms. Louise E. Rickard
Acting Executive Secretary
Department of Public Utility Control
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 06-05-13 — Application of the American Civil Liberties Union of CT for Investigation of AT&T and Verizon Regarding Disclosure of CT Customer Information and Request for Rulemaking

Dear Secretary Rickard:

Enclosed please find Verizon New York Inc.'s responses to the Department of Public Utility Control ("Department")'s interrogatories numbered TE-9 through TE-17.

This filing is submitted utilizing the Department's Web-Based Filing System. The electronic filing is complete and the paper original will be sent by overnight delivery to the Department. Service has been made pursuant to Section 16-1-15 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jane Lee

Attachments

cc: Office of Consumer Counsel
Service List

TE-9 **What is the nature of the CPNI information that the Company retains about its customers?**

Response: Verizon obtains and maintains information about customers that helps it to provide service. For example, Verizon collects and retains customer profile information (*e.g.*, the customer's name, address, the services purchased, special customer needs). Verizon also maintains billing records (*e.g.*, call detail records), though the particular types of records Verizon maintains may vary by service.

Docket No. 06-05-13
Interrogatory TE-10
Verizon New York Inc.
Date: August 4, 2006

TE-10 **At the time cited in the ACLU complaint what was the Company policy regarding dissemination of CPNI?**

Response: Verizon recognizes the importance of protecting its customers' privacy, and customer privacy is a priority for Verizon. Thus, Verizon only permits access to CPNI to those parties lawfully permitted to have such access, such as Verizon employees acting within the scope of normal business, customers requesting access to their own information, persons designated by the customers, government entities, or Verizon's contractors (vendors) or agents, if lawfully permitted. Such access is limited only to legitimate business purposes and in compliance with Verizon's legal obligations.

Verizon has a robust security organization and extensive procedures to detect inappropriate access to confidential information. These technical, procedural, and organizational measures are designed to safeguard computer systems and detect and thwart unauthorized access to Verizon's databases.

In addition, Verizon employees are trained to follow a strict "Code of Conduct," including specific requirements regarding the protection and use of CPNI. Employees who violate company standards and policies may be disciplined up to and including dismissal.

Specific caller identity validation procedures must be followed prior to releasing any CPNI. In particular, Verizon has procedures in place requiring employees to authenticate customer identity before providing subscriber account information and to verify the status of other persons claiming to be authorized to get access to account information before discussing account information. When a request for access to CPNI is received, these procedures assist Verizon to confirm the identity of the customer or employee before providing any specific subscriber account information that may be lawfully provided. These procedures address both employee interactions with residential and small business customers over the telephone as well as customer authentication requirements for on-line account management.

TE-11 **Has that policy changed? If so what is that policy now?**

Response: The response to interrogatory TE-10 describes Verizon's current policy and procedures with respect to CPNI.

Docket No. 06-05-13
Interrogatory TE-12
Verizon New York Inc.
Date: August 4, 2006

TE-12 **Under what circumstances will the Company release CPNI to any state or Federal government agency or private entity? Cite the legal authority for permitting such release.**

Response: As Verizon has explained, to the extent it provides assistance to the government for national security or other purposes, it "will provide customer information to a government agency only where authorized by law for appropriately-defined and focused purposes." *See Verizon Issues Statement on NSA and Privacy Protection,* News Release (May 12, 2006) (attached hereto as Exhibit 1). The same would be true for the release of CPNI to a private entity. The Wiretap Act, FISA, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, and the Telecommunications Act all expressly authorize disclosure of information to the government in a variety of circumstances.[1]

[1] *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2511(2), 2511(3), 2518(7), 2702(b), 2702(c), 2703, 2709; 50 U.S.C. §§ 1805(f), 1843. For example, Section 2709 requires a telephone company to disclose certain information if it receives a "national security letter." Similarly, Section 2511(2)(a) expressly authorizes companies to provide "information, facilities, or technical assistance" upon receipt of a specified certification "notwithstanding any other law."

TE-13 **Has the Company released CPNI to the NSA or any other Federal government entity as alleged by the ACLU in its May 24 2006 petition?**

Response: Verizon objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in its June 14, 2006 and June 28, 2006 letters filed with the Department of Public Utility Control in response to the Department's May 31, 2006 notice requesting comments. As explained in those letters, Verizon cannot respond to this interrogatory because federal law prohibits it from confirming or denying any cooperation with an alleged NSA or other federal intelligence program or providing other information concerning any such alleged cooperation. Verizon reserves all of its rights and does not waive any additional objections it may have with respect to this interrogatory.

TE-14 **If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company issued an order or subpoena to disclose the CPNI?**

Response: Verizon objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in its June 14, 2006 and June 28, 2006 letters filed with the Department of Public Utility Control in response to the Department's May 31, 2006 notice requesting comments. As explained in those letters, Verizon cannot respond to this interrogatory because federal law prohibits it from confirming or denying any cooperation with an alleged NSA or other federal intelligence program or providing other information concerning any such alleged cooperation. Verizon reserves all of its rights and does not waive any additional objections it may have with respect to this interrogatory.

Docket No. 06-05-13
Interrogatory TE-15
Verizon New York Inc.
Date: August 4, 2006

TE-15 **If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company paid for disclosing the CPNI to the NSA or other government agency?**

Response: Verizon objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in its June 14, 2006 and June 28, 2006 letters filed with the Department of Public Utility Control in response to the Department's May 31, 2006 notice requesting comments. As explained in those letters, Verizon cannot respond to this interrogatory because federal law prohibits it from confirming or denying any cooperation with an alleged NSA or other federal intelligence program or providing other information concerning any such alleged cooperation. Verizon reserves all of its rights and does not waive any additional objections it may have with respect to this interrogatory.

TE-16 **If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company under any threat of sanctions for failing to provide the CPNI?**

Response: Verizon objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in its June 14, 2006 and June 28, 2006 letters filed with the Department of Public Utility Control in response to the Department's May 31, 2006 notice requesting comments. As explained in those letters, Verizon cannot respond to this interrogatory because federal law prohibits it from confirming or denying any cooperation with an alleged NSA or other federal intelligence program or providing other information concerning any such alleged cooperation. Verizon reserves all of its rights and does not waive any additional objections it may have with respect to this interrogatory.

Docket No. 06-05-13
Interrogatory TE-17
Verizon New York Inc.
Date: August 4, 2006

TE-17 **If the answer to #13 is yes was the Company's release of CPNI in compliance with the Company's CPNI policy in existence at the time of the release of the CPNI?**

Response: Verizon objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in its June 14, 2006 and June 28, 2006 letters filed with the Department of Public Utility Control in response to the Department's May 31, 2006 notice requesting comments. As explained in those letters, Verizon cannot respond to this interrogatory because federal law prohibits it from confirming or denying any cooperation with an alleged NSA or other federal intelligence program or providing other information concerning any such alleged cooperation. Verizon reserves all of its rights and does not waive any additional objections it may have with respect to this interrogatory.